

# Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion



Vol. V, No. 7

April 30, 1945

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

## Reflections on the San Francisco Conference

AS the United Nations' Conference gathers at San Francisco and begins its work it is well for Christian people to remind themselves again and yet again of what is really happening. It is obvious to everyone that it is a meeting to set up an organization to prevent war and to make possible the development of cooperation among the nations of the world. It assumes that all nations have common interests of enough importance to warrant some surrender of what we vaguely call sovereignty. The conference is that to everyone. But it is in the Christian view far more than that. The struggle to build the right kind of world is a struggle to do God's will. This effort to bring the nations together in a world organization is the effort to express in concrete and visible form the ultimate reality in their relations to one another and to God. Men are the children of God. Men constitute God's one great family. In their long and arduous story of trial and error the plentiful error is due chiefly to their failure to conform the structure of society to that underlying reality. Men are one family. They must recognize that fact and embody it as well as they can in the world structure. The League of Nations failed not because the principle which it attempted to embody was wrong but because of the moral failure of the great powers—our own first of all—to support that principle.

The establishment of a general international organization is therefore for the Christian an attempt, perhaps issuing at first in very unstable and unsatisfactory form, to meet God's purpose at its deepest level. That gives the Conference its universal significance and makes the success of the attempt the dominating moral principle in all the questions which arise.

Those questions are many. Some of them turn on the matter of justice; some on the provisions for furthering human rights; some again on the fact that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals say nothing of what is to be done about colonies and dependent peoples. All these and other questions are important but none of them is as important as getting the organization started. The flare-up about three votes for Russia in the Assembly is puerile. The indigna-

tion at the treatment of Poland is chiefly anti-Russian in motive. The complaint at postponement of many questions until later is mostly due to lack of trust in the sincerity of the other great powers or of the leaders.

But in all these questions there are three things to remember. The first is that no one has as yet found a way to assure perfect justice. Indeed we are still wrestling as did Plato with the problem—what is justice anyhow? The second is that no one has as yet found a way to satisfy every one in any corporate effort. The third, already noted, is that answering none of the specific questions is as important as getting the organization started.

There has been much talk in certain religious groups about the danger of surrendering our ideals, of accepting a "realist" position and thus not only compromising with evil, but erecting our building *on sand*. The mistake such critics make is in confusing their scale of values. They don't see that a valid idealism takes hold and must take hold of things as they are and build out from them. That is prophetic idealism after the fashion of Isaiah and his spiritual kinsfolk. The ideal of unity, of getting together and getting started must in this case be the dominant moral issue.

There is no alternative. There is no other way to save us from the continued chaos of jungle ethics. To fight *against* the attempt to bring the nations together in a world body is to defy ultimate reality. To wreck the attempt on detail is to get the scale of values wrong. Here in this coming Conference the opportunity is presented to achieve a step forward in the right direction. We must help to make the plans as adequate as possible; but the end must never be forgotten.

And that seems to set the meaning and limits of criticism. There must be criticism. There must be freedom of speech. There must be acceptance after agreement, and otherwise than through the pressure of power. But the purpose of criticism must be to achieve the goal, and upon as high a level as possible. It must take account of the difficulties. It cannot be perfectionist. It must not further suspicion. There can be no progress without trust.

We must judge Russia and Britain as we would be judged: by our actions and not by conjectural motives. We must recognize that this is and can be only a beginning. But it must be a real beginning, and it can be that only as we genuinely trust each other. The way to overcome power politics is not to grumble about them and say we shall have nothing to do with such a plan. The power is there. We cannot escape that. It brings responsibility. The business of the ordinary citizen and especially

the Christian citizen is to accept the fact and then do what he can to see that we use the power rightly as a trustee. The only kind of criticism which ought to have any standing today is that which is aimed at making easier the achievement of the central purpose of the Conference. Here is the great opportunity before the world of today. If we fail, we fail only to face the necessity, perhaps after another terrible war, of trying again. God's great human family is one and his purpose is inexorable. E. L. P.

## The Treatment of Japan

PAUL C. T. KWEI

WE who are living to witness the tragedy that is repeating itself after the short span of a quarter of a century, must have learned that it is of paramount importance to win the peace as well as the war; and that science and technology have so shrunk the size of our planet, that we who inhabit distant parts of the world are one in weal and woe. While the millenium will not come with the end of this war, thoughtful men and women everywhere are anxious to know the real causes of war and are seeking practical means for the maintenance of peace. One shining hope in our present gloom has been that while the war is still going on, we have been thinking about and discussing the problems of peace. Let us hope and endeavor to take steps in the right direction for its satisfactory solution.

Crystallized Christian opinion is probably most clearly stated in the so-called "six pillars of peace" which have found wide acceptance. In applying it to the treatment of Japan, we want to make sure, on the one hand, that Japan must be so demilitarized that she cannot possibly commit acts of aggression in the next forty or fifty years, which would mean rather severe military and economic terms, and on the other hand, that she should not be given cause to feel that she is being enslaved or starved through unfair treatment so that she would be forced to fight for her freedom and existence. How the above principle can be practically worked out is a complicated problem.

The writer assumes that the United Nations will inflict upon Japan a total defeat by carrying the battle to the home islands of Japan. This is absolutely necessary to break the myth of the Japanese race being alone divinely descended and consequently invincible, which has been so effectively played up by Japanese militarists ever since 1894. It is also assumed that immediately following the end of the war, there will be a temporary army of occupation to see that the armistice and peace terms are faithfully be-

ing carried out. The international character of the army of occupation and of the control commission should be emphasized. The psychological effect of having exclusive Chinese or American control, even if that may be the assignment of a superior world organization, would be similar to the exclusive occupation of the Rhine by the French soldiers. It might be well to have some representation on the control commission of countries which have actually never been at war with Japan to assure her that the decisions would be basically fair. The peace terms should be rather severe in the beginning, but the international control commission should from time to time revise these terms, *pari passu* as Japan sincerely proves herself progressing along the road to international good will and peace.

The essential features of the territorial settlement were decided at the Cairo Conference when President Roosevelt, Generalissimo Chiang Kai Shek and Prime Minister Churchill issued a joint communique on the result of their deliberations. The terms provided that "Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the first World War in 1914, and all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores shall be restored to the Republic of China." In the same document it was mentioned in general terms that "Japan will be expelled from other territories which she has taken by violence and greed," and that "in due course Korea shall become free and independent."

It is only fair and right that stolen goods, such as Manchuria, and Formosa and the Pescadores, should be returned to China. Moreover ninety-five percent of the five million people in Formosa are Chinese. In the case of Manchuria, the Japanese colonial policy has been a flat failure. Between 1910 and 1930 while twenty million Chinese moved into Manchuria from Shantung and Hopei provinces, there were only

215,000 Japanese there, of whom 97 percent lived along the railway zone and consular jurisdiction areas. When we take into consideration the Chinese people who were already settled in Manchuria before 1910, the Japanese were less than one percent of the Chinese population. Even if we were to disregard historic justice and population claims, the fact that in 1930 out of a total population of 70,000,000, only 800,000 Japanese (or a little over one percent) were living outside of Japan, cannot justify the claim that Japan needed other people's territories to relieve her own population pressure. Like China and India and some of the densely populated countries of Europe, she should rather turn to science and technology for the solution of her problems alongside with peaceful and mutually beneficial trade with other nations.

In their excellent book "Control of Germany and Japan," Moulton and Marlio mentioned that as far as the records show, the colonies were fiscal liabilities to Japan. In Formosa, up to 1929, the government contribution amounted to 44,156,122 yen; the 1927 relief contribution was 204,987,122 yen and public borrowings were at 112,000,000 yen. In Korea, government contribution and loans totalled 563,000,000 yen. To the government of the Kwangtung Peninsula, Japan contributed 29.8% of the administrative expenses and for the mandated islands, 46.6%. Of course administrative expenses are not the sole index of economic loss or gain, but these must be deducted from the total gains through commerce or industrial development. The crux of the question is therefore whether after Japan loses her colonies there will be economic barriers prejudicial to her trade. If the nations adopt a long range liberal policy in relation to international trade, Japan will be the gainer instead of the loser. If national barriers of high tariff are erected after this war, then other nations as well as Japan will have to face the possibility of an economic depression. Thus whether Japan will starve after she loses her colonies will depend upon whether or not there will be a cooperative and liberal policy for trade among all nations.

Heavy industries are necessary for carrying on military operations. If Japan is to be deprived of her war potential, her heavy industries must be curtailed, or at least such components of these which can be used for war. When Manchuria is returned to China, Japan will lose her supply of iron and coal for her steel industry as well as the prospect of obtaining oil. She will also lose the South Manchurian Railroad which she has used for military and economic exploitation. The net result will be a material reduction of Japan's military threat and a substantial help to China in her program of industrialization and a fair though partial recompensation for the terrific losses which her aggressor neighbor has inflicted upon China during these long war years.

How much of Japan's heavy industries in the home islands should go, and how would they affect Japan's economic development? I think it is only reasonable that her airplane factories, her arsenals, her synthetic oil and rubber plants should be stopped at least for a couple of decades with gradual adjustment of controlled production as the world finds greater security for peace. During the same period, some sort of international commission should control the import of strategic materials, such as bauxite, tin, lead, nickel, copper, oil and rubber. It does not seem necessary to the writer to wipe out her machine tool, chemical and automobile industries, even though these have high convertibility for war purposes; for with the control of iron and coal and other strategic materials, these industries cannot expand to wartime proportions. At the same time these are necessary for the technological advancement of Japan.

Let it be noted that prior to 1931, Japan prospered on the development of her primary industries, such as textiles, foodstuffs, chemicals, metals, and machine tools. It was only when she forcibly occupied Manchuria that she embarked upon a program of development of heavy industries in preparation for her conquest of the Pacific regions. In fact the development of heavy war industries has only added its weight to the burden of her people. When we take the "gun" from the Japanese people, they can again go back to the peaceful development of her primary industries for which she is best fitted.

It is assumed that at the end of the war, much of the Japanese fleet will have been put out of commission. Likewise her merchant marine, which has been so skilfully built up in the course of fifty years will have suffered serious losses. What remains of her men-of-war will either have to be scrapped, or else will go to some of the United Nations as part of a just compensation. Shall we allow Japan to retain what is left over in her merchant marine? The writer is for Japan to retain it. Her world wide navigation has been one of her remarkable achievements in the past; she has a trained personnel for its successful operation; it will help her to pay for whatever commodities she will have to purchase from abroad; and with adequate control of her imports, these ships can serve a noble purpose for the mutually beneficial commerce between nations.

The stripping of the Pacific islands occupied by Japan will insure the United Nations of air bases to hold Japan in check. These islands have cost Japan both manpower and money and have given Japan no benefit except military advantages.

The complex problem of the demilitarization of Japan has brought out many divergent opinions. The armistice terms will of course be taken care of by military experts, who will undoubtedly be concerned with such questions as the neutralization of air and naval bases, the disposal of war factories



and associated plants, the stopping of the military training program and the training of aviators. But we realize as one of the Chinese sages pointed out over two thousand years ago, "when we conquer men by force, we may not win in their hearts." Consequently, we have come to realize the importance of the re-education of Japan. How are we going to do it? It is impractical to send "teachers of democracy" to "democratize" the Japanese people. These will immediately be taken as propagandists, and if they are forced upon them will incur nothing but stubborn resentment and opposition. Of course, we can do something in a negative way. We can see to it that all text books will delete such materials as would arouse international hatred and warlike spirit which can be found in history and story books. Perhaps we can promote the exchange of students and professors, hold international conferences of labor and industries, arrange to have moving picture films of the peace loving farmers and other people at work. But as James Yen pointed out in his recent town hall speech in New York, we must promote a re-education program of the whole world, both for the conquerors and the vanquished. While we condemn Japan for her belief in the "Mikado myth" and therefore the superiority of the Japanese race, are the other peoples free from racial prejudices? While we condemn Japan's power politics, are the United Nations free from practicing them? Are we giving up "spheres of influence" for world co-operation? The teachers of Japan must first practice what they teach.

What the government of Japan should be is for the Japanese people to decide, except when that form of government endangers the security and peace of other nations. In the present form of government, the ministers of war and of the navy are not directly responsible to the premier but to the Emperor. In this way, together with the "divinity myth" of the Mikado, the Japanese militarists have played upon the emotions of the people to carry on their designs of aggression. It seems necessary to abolish this "Mikado myth" by removing him from power and exiling him to a distant land. Perhaps the wise step to take is to find out the sentiment of the liberal elements of Japan when the war is over and to discuss with them what the consequences of the retention of the Emperor might be. At all events, we should insist that the military should be subordinate to the civil authority.

The future peace of the world is not insured by "the control of Japan and Germany" alone. What if Great Britain, the United States, China or Russia should in due course of time become the aggressor nation? The big job at the peace conference, following the Dumbarton Oaks conferences, is still ahead. It is difficult enough to devise legal means to maintain the world peace, but it is far more difficult to make the nations when they are involved in

controversies themselves observe the rules of the game. The present muddled pictures in Poland, in Greece, and in the Balkans in general make us question whether our great allies are ready to give up the ideas of spheres of influence and bilateral treaties and put their faith in a co-operative world organization for the maintenance of peace. It is hard for us to give up the "realistic attitude" to try a new experiment which may have doubtful results. And yet such realistic attitudes in the past have not eliminated the tragedies we have so far witnessed. It is certainly worth the attempt to try a new method, with all its risks and possibly a certain amount of sacrifices to the individual nations.

While many people recognize that the future peace of the world can be made secure by "the spiritual regeneration of men," the forces of religion are considered by the "realists," whose number is legion, to be too slow and idealistic a process. However, if the spiritual regeneration is as fundamental as we believe it to be, we must work for it, no matter how strenuous the process may be. Whatever the treatment of Japan may be, we are sure that there will be deep wounds and it is up to the Christian forces of all nations to heal those wounds. We can accomplish this not only by maintaining personal attitudes, but also by close co-operation with Japanese Christians and making the policy of our own individual government more in line with Christian ideals. The Christmas message gives us a fundamental truth that there will be "peace on earth" only when there is "good will among men."

## The Death of the President

THE American Presidency embodies two levels of political authority and prestige which a constitutional monarchy separates. The President is both King and Prime Minister. He symbolizes the perpetual authority of government as such but also embodies the immediate will of the nation as it becomes crystalized in party politics. The American Presidency has become the greatest single center of political power in the modern world. The death of a president, particularly of a great president, is therefore a great emotional shock to the nation. And since Mr. Roosevelt's authority and prestige transcended the boundaries of his own nation and he had become a symbol to the world of our nation's growing maturity and sense of responsibility toward the community of nations, his death has brought grief, and also some dismay and apprehension, to all the nations allied with us.

Our sense of grief is naturally mingled with gratitude for the providential emergence of this man in our national life at just such a time as this. There were those who tolerated his foreign policy because they believed in his domestic policy, while others

tolerated or opposed his domestic policy while they supported his foreign policy. But in a word, his greatness, surely, was derived from the fact that he understood the essential issue in both domestic and foreign affairs. He was the first of our political leaders who sought to bring the immense powers of government to bear upon the economic health of the nation and thus to break with the *laissez faire* tradition which had a stronger hold upon us than any modern industrial nation. While many feared, or pretended to fear, the accretion of political power which resulted from this policy, no one can deal honestly with the issues involved in this controversy if he does not recognize that the increase of political power in a modern industrial community is prompted and justified by the desire of the community to bring the economic power of a technical society under communal control. The idea that economic power is self-regulating belongs to the childhood of an industrial era and is refuted by all of its maturer experience. Roosevelt was no systematic political thinker; but he saw the main issue clearly and acted upon his convictions with as much consistency as the confused state of American public opinion would allow. Even his lack of consistency and his infinite capacity for improvisation had its virtuous side; for it is a question whether a more consistent or doctrinaire exponent of his policy could have achieved as much national unity around his central purpose as he achieved. While it is much too early to assess his place in American history adequately, one may hazard the guess that future historians will regard his administration as a new level of maturity in domestic policy. Here the nation became aware of the depth of the problems of justice in an industrial society and of the necessity of dealing with it politically.

In the same manner his foreign policy represented a new level of maturity in our relations to the world. Just as fabulous wealth had made it possible for us to evade the profounder economic issues a little longer than other nations, so also, our continental security tempted us to evade the problems of an unorganized world. Roosevelt came to power a year before Hitler did and by a curious historical irony the two careers run chronologically parallel even to the point where one may hope that the one will not outlast the other by more than a few months. Roosevelt was President of a nation which had recoiled from its previous effort in international affairs and which was almost psychopathic in its determination to stay out of the conflict which Hitler's movement made inevitable; yet he understood the nature of the international crisis from the beginning. On this issue, as well as in domestic policy his political ingenuity matched the clarity of his vision. The clarity of his vision was fully revealed in his famous "quarantine speech" in which he warned the world of the consequences of allowing aggression to go unchecked. His

political sagacity dictated a course which would not outrun the sentiments of a divided nation too far. A lesser statesman might have abandoned himself to a sense of futility. Yet Roosevelt was able to secure the passage of the lease-lend act from a divided nation, a policy which made it possible for us to prevent the collapse of the anti-Nazi cause, though a part of the nation was almost hysterically committed to the proposition that we had no responsibilities for the defeat of Nazism. Surely the passage of this act will go down in history as one of the greatest of his political achievements.

As the war finally drew to a triumphant conclusion, Roosevelt, seeking to avoid Wilson's mistakes, developed an international policy which, though it may err on the side of making too many concessions to the pride and power of the great nations, does at least guarantee that America will not again withdraw from its responsibilities in the world community. Nor can the concessions be regarded as merely unwarranted expediency. They are derived from a shrewd understanding of the limits of the will of a nation in creating international authority above its own sovereignty. In both the conduct of the war and in the peace negotiations Roosevelt has, in other words, expressed a higher form of political maturity than this nation has previously achieved. If the measures of international accord, now being taken, should prove inadequate, as indeed they may, the fault will lie not so much in the judgment of a man as in the historic situation. More adequate measures would have little chance of acceptance, either by our own nation or by the other great powers.

One of the consolations in the loss of so great a leader is the knowledge that what was right and true in the course he charted may the more certainly become settled national policy because death robs personal animus of its object and thereby removes a source of confusion to the conscience of the nation.

The sense of grief in the nation has been mingled not only with gratitude for the greatness of the lost leader but with a good deal of apprehension about the future. Is the new President, or any untried man, adequate to fill so great an office in so trying a period of national history? No one can answer that question. One can only hope and pray that the greatness of the office may, as it has sometimes done in the past, develop unknown resources in the man.

The American Presidency has undoubtedly become too powerful. It may be worth observing that this is not exactly the fault of Mr. Roosevelt as his critics have averred. Given the American constitutional system, which does not provide for a "responsible government" in the parliamentary sense of that phrase, only a strong President can save the nation from disaster in times of crisis. A weak President in times of depression and war, such as we have traversed in the past decades, would not have in-



creased the powers of his office. But our system does not function in such a way as to make it possible for Congress as such to master a crisis. Without a strong President disaster might well overwhelm us. We are not fully conscious of this fact because by great good fortune we have had great presidents in critical times. The fact that this can not always be so may well fill us with apprehension about the future; but it will not qualify our gratitude for past mercies, among which belong the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt during this fateful decade of our history.

R. N.

## Communication

Dear Sir:

A sentence in *TIME'S* review of Walter Karig's "Lower Than Angels" (February 26, 1945) has put the match to a powder keg I have been lugging around for weeks. The powder keg is a growing conviction that the Protestant Church for all its sincerity in Cleveland and all its earnestness in seeking to promote a just and durable peace is missing the point as far as effectively influencing its younger generation is concerned. The spiritual problem of the American man is not will-to-power, violence, or even carnality. He does not have to be propagandized into believing that war is wrong, cruel, and lustful. He does not have to be convinced that war is wasteful of men and resources and time. It is not as if these men *longed* for war as they long for sensual pleasure, financial power, or social prestige. Nor is it as if they had to be convinced to make the necessary economic and political concessions in the interests of peace. They will do that under the pressure of circumstance.

The central spiritual problem of Americans is not "social" but personal and a church which tries to deal with it in social terms is playing into the hands of the kind of quackery which now flourishes on every hill and under every green tree. That brings me to the sentence regarding Walter Karig's book:

"... the unchanging center of his (Marvin Lang's) life was the delicatessen." For thousands and thousands of Americans now overseas the *unchanging center* is a delicatessen or a white cottage or a corner drug store. On the surface such nostalgia seems commendable. It is catered to in every slick paper story and commercial ad. The soldier in Iwo Jima dreams of a Vermont trout stream or a soldier in the Siegfried Line remembers the beach at Santa Barbara. The pilgrim in exile remembers Zion by the waters of Babylon. There is much in the fierce homesickness of American men which suggests the impassioned spirit of the exilic psalms. But there is a difference, and unless the Protestant Church can discover what that difference is and minister to it, the job will be done by others. Al-

ready there are sizeable numbers of people in California and elsewhere who walk around in togas under the aegis of the Universal Cauliflower.

The nostalgia of the Psalms is ambivalent. The Jew by the rivers remembered his little farm in *time* with its specific landmarks and its shy beauty. When he said Zion, he thought of grain fields and grape vines. But he also thought of *eternity*, the City of God, which gave validity to his bread and his wine. They were related as shadow to substance, these two cities: Jerusalem and Zion.

The ambiguity of American nostalgia derives from its confusion of these two discreet realms. Far away from home the American thinks of Topeka as the Celestial City; because he is very vague about God, he deifies his family and his friends; future *time*, the time he can visualize *after* his homecoming, glows with an impossible radiance. Thus America to him is an idol which he conceives to be God. The difficulty with this type of quasi-religion is that it doesn't pay off. Topeka is not the city four square. Our families and friends, like us, are human, all too human, a fact we discover the first time the toast burns. Future time is related to present time and will carry with it a burden of its own. The realization of these facts will lead to that cynicism which lies at the root of sensuality and turpitude. Or it will lead to an infantilism which seeks to dignify delicatessens into temples by housing them in Greek colonnades or which makes fraternal orders into the vehicles of eternal mysteries by endowing them with masks and handclasps.

For this state of affairs we are all responsible. Many of us Protestants have been intellectually ashamed of anything which smacked of otherworldliness. Now our young men are finding themselves in situations where their existential needs are making themselves felt and they have no clear and distinct idea of how they may be satisfied. They seek for the fatherland of peace but have no map save one of the city of destruction. And so they are driven to two expressions: violent hatred of the place where they are (what is called "parochial xenophobia" by *TIME*) and a deification of creatures. Pin-up girls and comic strips become the "rose of blessedness" and the Hit Parade is the quiring of the seraphic hosts. Paradise is a delicatessen. Unfortunately delicatessens deal only in sausages and pickles and not in the bread which comes down from heaven. For the profound homesickness of the human spirit no cosmic delicatessen however splendid will ultimately suffice. For delicatessens deal in lentil soup and messes of pottage and not in birthrights and blessings. And it is the latter we seek, even we who have been beguiled so often into playing Esau.

Sincerely,

KARL A. OLSSON, Chaplain, U.S.A.

# The World Church: News and Notes

## Distinguished Churchmen to Visit America

Church circles throughout America are eagerly awaiting the visit here, during the month of May, of three of Europe's most distinguished churchmen: Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, Geneva, Switzerland; the Bishop of Chichester, Dr. G. K. A. Bell; Dr. Marc Boegner, head of the French Evangelical Churches.

All three are members of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches and will be attending a meeting of that organization in New York City during the second week in May, according to Dr. Henry Smith Leiper, General Secretary of the American Committee for the World Council of Churches, the organization under whose auspices the visit is being planned.

## Metropolitan Benjamin Assails Catholics

Metropolitan Benjamin, head of the Orthodox Church in America, delivered an address upon his return from Russia in which he praised Marshal Stalin for "doing everything possible to nourish the resurgence of religion now sweeping the Soviet Union." He also made a vigorous attack on Roman Catholicism on the grounds that it is asking for a soft peace for Germany.

"What must the world think," he declared, "of those Roman Catholics who suddenly have become lovers of peace. These are the same priests who were so silent when their fascist friends were killing women and children in Spain, when Hitler was ravaging all of Europe, murdering millions of human beings by the foulest of means. But now that the Red Army has snatched victory from defeat, when the Soviet Union and her allies have brought fascism to its knees, these once so silent Roman Catholics suddenly are clamoring for what they call a just peace."

"There can be no such thing as justice for murderers. These Roman Catholics are simply making themselves ridiculous. Hitler and his gang of criminals must be punished, but no matter how severe the punishment it will still fail to make full reparation for their enormous crime against humanity."

As we have previously observed, the slavish devotion of the Orthodox Church to Soviet policy is rather ominous. Its criticism of the Vatican's warnings against the peace of vengeance is particularly ill-advised because the Pope's statements upon this problem have been informed by the clearest Christian principles.

## Recommendations for the United Nations Charter

The results of a study of Catholic, Jewish and Protestant pronouncements on the moral principles of a just world order discloses that the agencies which issued them are agreed upon ten recommendations for the United Nations Charter to be drafted at San Francisco, which "offer practical guidance to all men of good will."

The study was made by the Rev. Richard M. Fagley, Secretary, Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, Federal Council of Churches; Rabbi Ahron Opher, Secretary, Committee on Peace, Synagogue Council of

America, and Rev. Edward A. Conway, S.J., Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

In emphasizing the moral imperative of a world security organization as the first of ten points on which agencies of the three religious bodies are agreed, the study holds that "the sacrifices and hardships of this war and the need of mankind for an organized peace make it imperative that the San Francisco conference succeed and the general security organization be established."

The study sets forth nine recommendations for improvement of the United Nations Charter. They called for:

1. A preamble to affirm subjection of all states to the moral law.
2. Eventual universal membership.
3. Codification and development of international law.
4. More explicit provision for revising treaties and other agreements.
5. Larger participation of lesser powers in policy-shaping.
6. Clearer procedures for mutual disarmament.
7. Denying to any nation power to veto judgment in a dispute covered by international law.
8. Formulation of an international bill of human rights and establishment of implementing agencies.
9. Trusteeship commission for dependent peoples.

The three clergymen who joined in the study took an active part in the issuance two years ago of the "Pattern for Peace," the historic declaration setting forth the moral principles for a just peace which was signed by 146 Catholic, Protestant and Jewish leaders. They have since collaborated as editors of "Pattern's Progress" in reporting inter-faith action in support of "Pattern for Peace," such as mass meetings in Syracuse, Toledo, Kansas City, Los Angeles, San Antonio and other cities, and the recent House resolution to make the "Pattern for Peace" the basis of American foreign policy. The resolution was introduced by Representatives Feegan, Ohio (Roman Catholic); LaFollette of Indiana (Protestant), and Weiss of Pennsylvania (Jewish).

## Dutch Churches Praised for "Uncompromising Stand" Against Persecution of Jews

Tribute to the churches of Holland for their uncompromising stand against persecution of the Jews was paid a group of Protestants of Dutch-Jewish origin. They were recently released to Switzerland from the Theresienstadt "Ghetto" near Prague in Czechoslovakia.

"We mention especially," said a message issued to fellow Christians, "the courageous attitude of the Dutch churches which again and again, regardless of risks, protested strongly, both publicly and in discussions with German authorities, against anti-Semitic measures. We remember with great gratitude and respect those of our supporters whose unselfish intervention led to imprisonment and in some cases execution."

R. N. S.

# Christianity and Crisis

*A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion*

601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

GLOSTER MORRIS, *Editorial Assistant*

## The Church in Occupied China

The life of the Christian Church in occupied China has been disrupted very little by the Japanese, and interest and church attendance are higher than before the war. This was the opinion of Dr. T. Z. Koo, one of the secretaries of the World's Student Christian Federation, who has been in Shanghai since the outbreak of the Pacific war and recently escaped to Free China.

Except for the removal of foreign workers, the church has gone on in much the same way as before the war. Chinese pastors are free to perform their ministries, to preach and to travel their circuits and districts. Only when they are "indiscreet" in their pro-nationalist or anti-Japanese sentiments are they questioned by the gendarmes. Dr. Koo said he knew of no Christian who was in jail because he was a Christian.

All churches in Shanghai are packed full, Dr. Koo reported. "There are two reasons for this," he said. "First, the Chinese people find in the church a circle of friends where they can speak freely and have a relationship of community life which is safe from the invader. Second, almost everyone in occupied China has lived through hard times and is thankful for deliverance. He has come to an awareness of a guiding force which has seen him through adversity, and he calls it God. He is more sober, more religious, less flippant, and the church has meant a great deal to him."

Dr. Koo preached for two years in the Community Church of Shanghai, a congregation which was before the war two-thirds Anglo-Saxon and one-third Chinese. At the outbreak of the war it lost two-thirds of its membership through internment. But, said Dr. Koo, when I left in September 1944, we had more members than we did before the war. Many were students and other young people, he said.

R. N. S.

**Periodical Division**  
**Detroit Public Library**  
**5201 Woodward Ave.**  
**Detroit 2, Mich.**

650 1-46

## Flynn Carried Vatican Memorandum to Moscow

Edward J. Flynn, personal envoy of President Roosevelt, carried a memorandum from the Vatican on his recent trip to Moscow which sought clear-cut replies by the Soviet government to three specific propositions regarding East European Catholics, it was learned from an authoritative source.

The memorandum, it is understood, requested:

1. Permission for Rome to send priests immediately to East European countries at present under Russian occupation.
2. Approval for the reopening of church institutions in these areas.
3. Assurances in regard to Russian intentions toward Italian prisoners in the U.S.S.R.

The reaction of Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs Molotov was that the Soviet government could not specify its attitude toward East European Catholics before determining their sentiments toward Russian occupation authorities.

Indications were that while Premier Stalin is anxious to settle the status of Catholics in Poland and other occupied countries so as to avoid tension in these regions, a complicating factor is the strong opposition among Russian and other Orthodox churches to any dealings with the Pope.

R. N. S.

## Says Cooperation Between Churches In France and Russia is "Doubtful"

Cooperation between churches in France and Russia is doubtful at present, according to Professor Nicholas Zander, vice-chairman of the Eastern Orthodox Committee for Ecumenical Action, recently created under the chairmanship of Archimandrite Jonesco, of the Rumanian Orthodox Church.

"The question arises," Professor Zander said, "if in the future Moscow will take an active part in ecumenical organization, and whether, besides the presence of bishops as official representatives, it will be possible to invite representatives of the secular clergy and of Russian youth movements to ecumenical gatherings."

The Orthodox leader, who acts as secretary for Metropolitan Eulogius in ecumenical matters involving the Western European emigre dioceses of the Russian Orthodox Church, said that "on this point I am not sanguine, but, in fact, even skeptical."

He stated that the Russian Orthodox Theological Academy in Paris, in which he is a professor, remains "the only true Russian center of the ecumenical ideal." He added that "although the academy's activities in the ecumenical field are unofficial, it is, however, a source of documentation for Metropolitan Eulogius, who has always protected the ecumenical ideal among Orthodox believers."

R. N. S.

## Authors in This Issue

Dr. Paul C. T. Kwei was formerly professor at Hua Chung College and is now Dean of the College of Science at the National Wuhan University of China. Dr. Kwei is at present engaged in scientific research at the Carnegie Institution in Washington, D. C.